



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,920	06/05/2004	Chengpu Wang		3919
36982	7590	05/24/2007		
WANG, CHENGPU 40 GROSSMAN STREET MELVILLE, NY 11747				
			EXAMINER	
			KIM, KENNETH S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/709,920

Applicant(s)

WANG, CHENGPU

Examiner

Kenneth S. KIM

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.


- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 9, 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


KENNETH S. KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Jun25'04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-5,7-9,11,12,14-16,27-41,66,67,70,73-76,80-85,90-92,94,95,99-106,108,112,115-117,121-123,125 and 170-215.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1-5,7-9,11,12,14-16,27-41,66,67,70,73-76,80-85,90-92,94,95,99-106,108,112,115-117,121-123,125 and 170-215.

Art Unit: 2111

Applicant is encourage to make use of the Office of Independent Inventors at the Patent Office set up to assist independent inventors as much as possible.

1. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 27-41, 66, 67, 70, 73-76, 80-85, 90-92, 94, 95, 99-106, 108, 112, 115-117, 121-123, 125, and 170-215 are presented for examination.

2. Applicant is requested to submit the non-patent publications cited in the IDS filed June 25, 2004.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 27-41, 66, 67, 70, 73-76, 80-85, 90-92, 94, 95, 99-106, 108, 112, 115-117, 121-123, 125, and 170-215 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(a) Claim 1, the phrase (b) is confusing with respect to the addressable register, for it is not appropriate to have an element the instruction means to behave another element in the memory element in the base claim. Furthermore, "behaving as" is an abstract description.

(b) Claim 2, suggest a preamble like "Method of using said apparatus of claim 8 for storing and processing an array of items", and it is not clear what is meant by

Art Unit: 2111

“concurrently defining a new array within an existing array”. Each step should be singular, not steps.

- (c) Claim 3, “means by means” is not an appropriate grammatical construction.
- (d) Claim 4, “a bus standard” appears to be an inappropriate element label.
- (e) Claim 4, it is not clear what is meant by “making ... in full compliance with”.
- (f) Claim 7, suggest “Method of using apparatus of claim 1 comprising the steps of “, and no “said apparatus” in the preamble or the body of the claim.
- (g) Claim 8, “a unique element address” in (a5) is not a physical element, and “carrying out” is an abstract description, perhaps “executing” could be used.
- (h) Claim 8, “said external bus” lacks antecedent basis, and it is not clear whether the communication means is coupled to the external bus connection.
- (i) Claim 8, the interconnection of the exclusive means to other element is not clear.
- (j) Claim 8, it is not clear whether the concurrent means actually executes an instruction, and there is a confusion regarding execution means in (a4) and (d3).
- (k) Claim 8, there is a confusion regarding instruction means in (d1) and (e), it is not clear what is meant by “carrying out”, and the phrase in (d1) is incomplete.
- (l) Claim 8, it is not clear what is meant by “translating .. into” and “presenting .. at”.
- (m) Claim 10, it is not clear what is meant by “an instruction kernel” and what is its function.
- (n) Claims 14 and 15, “means for *using* an element to enable another element” is not an appropriate description” “Using” is an abstract term.
- (o) Claim 27, the same as (g) to (l), and “defining” is an abstract description.

Art Unit: 2111

- (p) Claim 31, "concurrently finding no said element" is not a grammatically correct description. The same for Claim 32(c1).
- (q) Claims 33 and 35, the same as (f) and (p).
- (r) Claim 39, "status bit" is not a physical element.
- (s) Claim 66, "input data of instruction input" and not "instruction input" comprises the data items.
- (t) Claim 70, the same as (b) and (f), and "significance" is an abstract term.
- (u) Claim 90, part (b) is not an appropriate construction.
- (v) Claim 179, the preamble is inappropriate.
- (w) Claim 192, it is not clear what is meant by step (p) and appears to be an inappropriate description.
- (x) Applicant is requested to clarify all other claims in the same, similar or analogous manner.
- (y) Applicant is advised to draw each invention as claimed and see whether all interconnections are present and appropriate and whether all claim limitations are correct and make sense.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yoshizawa et al taught processor units accessible as memory.

Chung taught an intelligent memory architecture.


Art Unit: 2111

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth S KIM whose telephone number is (571) 272-3627. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-17:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (571) 272-3632. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for all communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

May 15, 2007


KENNETH S. KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER